

REMARKS

In the parent application Ser. No. 09/675,259 filed September 28, 2000, a Final Office Action dated June 3, 2004, rejected claims 1-10 for being unpatentable over Patel. The present continuation application has been filed to further prosecute claims 1-10. Thus, the instant Preliminary Amendment will address the rejections from the parent application's Final Office Action.

Claims 1 and 6 have been amended for clarity to include the limitation that the array of contacts on the surface of the power converter and the array of contacts on the land grid array socket are in direct physical contact with each other. Support for these amendments can be found, for example, at page 6, lines 24-26 and in the various Figures of the present application.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present U.S. application. Claims 1-10 remain in the application.

A. 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Patel - Claims 1-10

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the U.S. Patent No. 6,366,467 issued April 2, 2002 to P.R. Patel, et al. (hereinafter "Patel") (Office Action, page 2).

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention

must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).


With regard to claims 1-10, the Office relies on the Patel patent for a teaching of a “land grid array socket or interposer mounted to an array of contacts on a surface of a power converter (Office Action, page 2). However, Patel teaches that the array of contacts on the surface of the SDC are mounted to a package 602, rather than being mounted to the interposer (col. 5, lines 4-7).

Independent claims 1 and 6 have been amended for clarity to include the limitation that the array of contacts on the surface of the power converter and the array of contacts on the land grid array socket are in direct physical contact with each other. Since Patel teaches the array of contacts on the surface of the power converter are in direct contact with the package, and not the land grid array socket, Patel patent does not teach or disclose all of the limitations of amended claims 1 and 6, thus claims 1 and 6 are not anticipated by Patel. Since dependent claims 2-5 and 7-10 depend from claims 1 and 6 respectively, they are not anticipated by Patel. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 102(e) rejection of claims 1-10 are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicants request allowance of the application. Please forward further communications to the address of record. If the Examiner needs to contact the below-signed agent to further the prosecution of the application, the contact number is (503) 264-0944.

Dated: October 4, 2004

Respectfully submitted,


Kathy Ortiz
Agent for Applicants
Reg. No. 54,351

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1010, Alexandria, VA 22313 on:

4 OCTOBER 2004
Date of Deposit

DEBORAH L. HIGMAN
Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

 10-4-04
Signature Date